

REMARKS

[002] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-12, 15-18, 48-59, 61-63, 84-87, 93 and 94 are currently pending
- Claims 1, 48, and 84 are amended herein

Cited Documents

[003] The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- **APPLE:** Kirk Hiner, DragThing v4.3, June 14, 2002
<http://www.applelinks.com/reviews/dragthing-v4.shtml>
- **DT1:** James Thomson, DragThing v4.3, April 19, 2002
<http://web.archive.org/web/20020524155927/http://www.dragthing.com/>
- **DT2:** James Thomson, DragThing version history v4.3 and below pages 4-20, 4-9-2002 <http://www.dragthing.com/english/history4.html>

DragThing Fails to Anticipate Claims 1-3, 5-12, 15-18, 48-59, 61-63, 84-87, 93 and 94

[004] Claims 1-3, 5-12, 15-18, 48-59, 61-63, 84-87, 93 and 94 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *DragThing*. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 1

[005] Applicant submits that the Office has not shown that *DragThing* anticipates this claim. *DragThing* does not disclose the following features of this claim, as amended (with emphasis added):

1. (Currently Amended) A method for managing at least two software applications on a display of a computer system comprising:

instantiating a first software application on the computer system;

instantiating an other than a first software application on the computer system;

rendering the first software application in a first graphical window on a first portion of the display and in a first graphic control on a second portion of the display as a result of the instantiation of the first software application;

rendering the other than the first software application in an other than the first graphical window on the first portion of the display and in an other than the first graphic control on the second portion of the display as a result of the instantiation of the other than the first software application; and

while the first software application and the other than the first software application are instantiated:

obtaining an indication to organize the first graphic control and the other than the first graphic control in a group, wherein obtaining the indication includes rendering a set of guides representing inclusion or exclusion from one or more possible groupings in the second portion of the display;

grouping the first and the other than the first graphic controls on the second portion of the display according to the obtained indication; and

rendering the grouping in a bordered group in the second portion of the display,

the bordered group including the first and the other than the first graphic controls and a graphic group control

preserving a layout, as rendered on the first portion of the display, of each graphical window that corresponds to each graphic control in the group.

[006] Claim 1 recites in part, "***preserving a layout, as rendered on the first portion of the display, of each graphical window that corresponds to each graphic control in the group.***" The Office cites DragThing, DT2, page 21, par.4 and page 18, par. 2 as disclosing processes that are doc items, which can be selected and dragged to new locations. (Office Action, page 6.) DragThing describes a method of managing documents, folders, and programs through the use of icons in a dock.

[007] In contrast, Claim 1 recites, ***preserving a layout, as rendered on the first portion of the display, of each graphical window that corresponds to each graphic control in the group.***" DragThing is neither cited for nor discloses the above recital.

[008] Consequently, DragThing does not disclose all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant submits that DragThing does not anticipate this claim, and respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 2-12 and 15-18

[009] Claims 2-12 and 15-18 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited documents, and is therefore allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 2-12 and 15-18 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Independent Claim 48

[0010] For reasons similar to those set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that this claim is allowable. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 49-59 and 61-63

Claims 49-59 and 61-63 ultimately depend from independent claim 48. As discussed above, claim 48 is not obvious over the cited documents, and is therefore allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 49-59 and 61-63 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Independent Claim 84

[0011] For reasons similar to those set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that this claim is allowable. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 85-87 and 93-94

Claims 85-87 and 93-94 ultimately depend from independent claim 84. As discussed above, claim 84 is not obvious over the cited documents, and is therefore allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 85-87 and 93-94 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Claim 4 is Non-Obvious Over DragThing

[0012] Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over *DragThing*. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Dependent Claim 4

[0013] Claim 4 ultimately depends from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, dependent claim 4 is also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least its dependency on an allowable base claim. Additionally, this claim may also be allowable for the additional features that it recites.

Conclusion

[0014] Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Robert L. Villhard/ Dated: November 4, 2009

Robert L. Villhard(bob@leehayes.com; 512-505-8162 x5005)
Registration No. 53725